



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,301	12/12/2001	Matthias Stefan Bierbrauer	DE920000115US1	5600

7590

02/25/2005

Gregory M. Doudnikoff
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,301

Applicant(s)

BIERBRAUER ET AL.

Examiner

Pramila Parthasarathy

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication filed on December 12, 2001. No preliminary amendments to the specification were filed. Claims 1 – 7 are currently being considered.

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the line "The present invention to provides ..." is not meaningful. Please delete "to".

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1- 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,810,404).

4. Regarding Claim 1, Ferguson teaches and describes a method for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), said method comprising the steps of:

providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process (Column 3 lines 47 – 59, Column 17 lines 12 – 20 and 59 – 67); and

invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process (Column 3 line 60 – Column 4 line 35).

5. Regarding Claim 6, Ferguson teaches and describes a method for executing an agent comprising customized code relative to documents being archived from a document processing system (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), said method comprising the steps of :

selecting a document resident in the document processing system for archiving (Column 14 lines 58 – 65 and Column 17 lines 21 – 25) ;

creating an archiving request for the selected document to an archiving engine associated with the document processing system (Column 17 lines 21 – 33);

invoking a pre-archiving agent, if any, on the selected document (Column 17 lines 33 – 37);

when the pre-archiving agent is finished archiving the selected document
(Column 17 lines 33 – 37);

involving a post-archiving agent, if any, on the archived document (Column 17 lines 33 – 41 and Column 18 lines 24 – 30), Ferguson teaches that the file helper utility continues to make an index of each archived document (acting as a post-archiving agent); and

when the post-archiving agent is finished, marking archived document as 'archived' (Column 17 lines 30 – 37), Ferguson teaches that a thumbnail representation ('marking archived') of each archived document.

6. Regarding Claim 7, Ferguson teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), said system comprising:

means for providing customized code for execution during the off-loading process (Column 3 lines 47 – 59, Column 17 lines 12 – 20 and 59 – 67); and

means for invoking the customized code when an off-loading request is issued relative to a document in the document processing system synchronously to the off-loading process (Column 3 line 60 – Column 4 line 35).

7. Claim 2 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code is invoked synchronously to process the document before the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system (Column 17 lines 25 – 33).

8. Claim 3 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code is invoked synchronously to process the document after the document has been off-loaded from the document processing system (Column 17 lines 25 – 45).

9. Claim 4 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code forms an agent,

the agent being invoked via a plug-in interface to the document processing system
(Column 3 lines 30 – 55).

10. Claim 5 is rejected as applied about in rejecting Claim 1. Furthermore, Ferguson teaches and describes in a computing environment, a system for processing documents being off-loaded in a document processing system in which requests are executed by an off-loading process (Fig. 1B, Summary; Column 3 line 24 – Column 4 line 35 and Column 17 line 12 – Column 18 line 35), wherein the customized code runs inside a plug-in architecture (Column 3 lines 30 – 55).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday – Thursday 8:00a.m. To 3:00p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-232-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy

February 18, 2005.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kim Vu', with a stylized, flowing script.

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100